

A Guide to Interrogation Techniques in the MPF

The standard para-military force of the Combine Civil Authority, the Metropolice, is required (as every police force generally is) quite frequently to interrogate suspects for information. This is a highly delicate process, as you can imagine, and is fraught with pitfalls that can result in termination of the interrogation and the loss of further information. To help combat those pitfalls and provide a sense of order to what is inherently a highly subjective and personal discipline. This is not a book of laws and codes that you are expected to memorize and apply in every situation- Rather, it is a group of guidelines designed to help you get the upper hand on a suspect during an interrogation (and, by extension, allow you to extract useful information from him). These guidelines do not encompass every technique available, but instead focuses on the ones most commonly used (and the ones most commonly useful) in an interrogation- It is up to the individual to decide which technique is best for which situation. Before we begin, however, I shall introduce to you a few terms that will be commonly used throughout this guidebook, so you can understand what they mean when they are used.

Questioner - The interrogator.

Subject/Suspect - The person being questioned.

The booth - The questioning room.

Break - To break the will of the subject; to remove his capacity for resistance.

Intel - Intelligence; any information that can be considered "actable" or "useful."

The first step to any interrogation is to have a plan. But why, you may ask, should you bother with a plan when any plan is bound to fall apart under the rigors and stresses placed upon it in the booth? To this I respond with three simple reasons why you should have a plan:

- 1) No two interrogations are the same, obviously. Each is defined by the personality of the subject. Therefore, in order to formulate a strategy that most effectively exploits the strengths and weaknesses of the subject, one requires a plan.
- 2) The long-term goal of any interrogation is to extract every bit of useful information from the subject. In order to achieve this goal, his capacity for resistance should be replaced with a cooperative attitude. The best way to do this is to plan out a method of interrogation that breaks down the subject over time and puts you in a position to gain useful information.
- 3) Interrogation is an ongoing process that effects everything that comes after it. Continuing to apply techniques to break a subject that do not work will bolster his confidence and ability to resist. Therefore it is in the questioner's best interests to plan out proper techniques that will be effective on the subject during his time in the booth.

Before creating a plan, however, you must screen the subject in order to determine the following:

- A) His background data.
- B) How much he knows.
- C) His previous exposure to interrogation and/or detention.

You must also psychologically assess the subject in order to determine the following:

- A) Into which emotional category he fits.
- B) Any psychological abnormalities.
- C) His degree of willingness to cooperate.
- D) What his potential vulnerabilities are.
- E) How he views his potential for surviving his situation.
- F) Whether he feels that revealing the desired information poses a personal threat to him.
- G) What course of action will reduce his ability to resist.

You should also study:

- A) The subject's organization.
- B) The areas in which he has operated.
- C) All recent travel of the subject.
- D) The subject's personal belongings.
- E) Other related information from another other sources you may have.

Finally, once you have assessed the subject psychologically and examined his background, you are ready you create the plan. After collating all of the information you have collected prior, you should begin to sketch out your plan. Your plan should be methodical and should be prepared systemically, but remember to leave room for revision as the interrogation progresses- This is especially true for the psychologically assessment, as it must constantly be updated based on new evaluations.

The Plan

A) The Objective of the Interrogation

- 1) What information do we want to obtain?
- 2) Why do we feel the subject has this information?
- 3) How important is this information?
- 4) How can we best obtain this information?

If you cannot define specific goals clearly, you should investigate further before beginning your interrogation. Any confusion regarding the purpose of the questioning or the belief that the goals will "take shape" after the interrogation is under way is almost certain to lead to aimlessness and failure.

B) Resistance by the Subject

- 1) What type and intensity of resistance is anticipated?
- 2) Is the information damaging to the subject in any way?
- 3) Can this information be obtained from other sources?
- 4) Which techniques will probably be most successful in overcoming resistance?
- 5) Which rationalization will best aid the subject in overcoming his resistance?

Underestimating the subject's capacity to resist is one of the most damaging mistakes you can make while inside of the booth. Once emboldened, it is extremely difficult to break down a subject's will. Having a plan to overcome the resistance of the subject is key to the success of any interrogation.

C) The Interrogation Room

- 1) Is the room free of distractions?
- 2) Are the furnishings conducive to the desired mood?
- 3) Are there provisions for outside viewing and recording?
- 4) Are there provisions for restraints (if required)?
- 5) Are there provisions for refreshments (if required)?

Setting is key to any interrogation. Different techniques require different approaches when furnishing an interrogation room. While it is difficult to modify the Nexus to fit a specific mood (the Nexus lends itself to more coercive techniques of interrogations, by its harsh lighting and metallic look), it is certainly not impossible. Changing the lighting conditions and adjusting the furniture to something either more or less comfortable than “normal” are some of the easiest things one can do to adjust the mood.

D) The Participants

- 1) Will the subject be questioned alone or jointly with other subjects?
- 2) Will there be more than one questioner? If so, how will the team function?
- 3) What other support will be required (doctor, psychiatrist, interpreter, etc.)?
- 4) Have possible reasons for changing interrogators been anticipated and planned for?
- 5) Has the interrogator determined his bargaining position?

Questioning a pair of subjects separately is the easiest way to evoke feelings of isolation and being “cut off” from friendly aid; this also permits a number of techniques to be used that would not be possible otherwise. Confrontation of two subjects in order to produce admissions is exceedingly dangerous and should only be used in the rarest of occasions. Furthermore, interrogators working in teams should have a plan for what roles each of them will have and how they will function (and how they should be rehearsed).

E) The Timing

- 1) What is the estimated time to accomplish the objectives of the interrogation?
- 2) How much time is available for detention of the subject?
- 3) Has a complete schedule of sessions been planned?

With the nature of Combine rule, the timing section is often considered the most irrelevant-Prisoners can be kept for indefinite periods of time, provided they are kept alive. Sessions, however, should be planned in advance and the interrogation (as a whole) should not take longer than it needs to. Interrogation of a resistant subject should be done on a varying schedule to disrupt his sense of chronological order; disorientation reduces capacity for resistance.

F) The Termination

- 1) Will the subject simply be released?
- 2) Will he be turned over to another service?
- 3) Is operational use contemplated?

Often, it is unnecessary to formulate a strategy for the termination of an interrogation, again due to the nature of Combine rule- Citizens are generally shipped off to labor camps or amputated after their usefulness has been served. However, certain approaches (especially more benevolent ones) in the booth can lead to a cooperate citizen, one who can be released back into the general public provided that he knows little about the MPF's operational techniques. This citizen can be an important propaganda tool. It is also key to make sure that the subject does not feel that he is going to be killed after he divulges his information- This will result in a belief that, because he is going to die anyway, he has no reason to give up his information. Once this begins, it is nearly impossible to revert. Avoid fostering this type of behavior at every point in your interrogation.

Once your plan is complete, it is necessary to put it into action during the interrogation. With any interrogation following a plan, there are four phases (though they may not be completely distinct from one another, they often are):

- A) The Opening
- B) The Reconnaissance
- C) The Detailed Questioning
- D) The Termination

These will be addressed in sequential order, beginning with the opening of the interrogation and proceeding through to the termination of the interrogation (be it either voluntary or forced due to a mistake).

A) The Opening

The principal goal during the opening phase of the interrogation is to confirm that your personality assessment (done prior to the writing of your plan) was correct and to gain a deeper understanding of the subject. Here, the subject should be allowed to talk without interruption; he may reveal facts that were previously overlooked and (if background information was incomplete or not available) allow you to gain access to that information.

The second goal is to achieve a sense of being "in sync" with the subject, or (in other words) establishing rapport. A lack of rapport may cause a subject to withhold information that he would have otherwise provided freely. Establishing rapport may induce the subject who is determined to withhold information to change his attitude. However, the interrogator should not feel that he doesn't need to establish rapport because of a belief that "no man in his right mind would incriminate himself." The history of interrogation is full of confessions and self-incriminations; most of these are involuntary or the result of a slip-up by the subject.

During the opening, the interrogator should remain business-like but friendly. He should avoid being drawn into a conflict of personalities with the subject where the subject's self-esteem is involved; hostility from the subject is best handled by a calm interest in what has aroused him. For example, when encountering hostility, one might ask: "Why don't you tell me what's made you so angry?"

The tertiary goal for the interrogator during the opening is to determine the reason for any resistance by the subject. Usually, any resistance by the subject is for one of four reasons:

- 1) A specific negative reaction to the interrogator.
- 2) Resistance "by nature" to any compliance with authority.
- 3) The information sought is damaging or incriminating.
- 4) Ideological resistance because of a belief in a cause.

Any interrogator who feels that he is hearing a cover story during the opening should resist the natural urge to demonstrate how false it is. It is better to leave an avenue of escape for the subject to use to correct his story without looking foolish; as Sun-Tzu said, a surrounded enemy fights with the strength of a cornered animal. Without an escape route, a subject tends to lock down, a process that is nearly impossible to reverse.

The opening should last as long as it takes to establish rapport or to determine that cooperation is unobtainable before moving on to step two.

B) The Reconnaissance

If rapport has been established and the subject is cooperative, this step can be bypassed. However, if the subject is uncooperative, the purpose of this step is to probe the causes, extent, and intensity of his resistance to determine the kind and degree of pressure that will be needed during the third phase.

During the reconnaissance phase, two dangers are likely to appear. As the subject has been allowed to talk for as long as he or she wished, lines of questioning that have met resistance have not continued. However, now that subjects of sensitivity are being revisited, the rapport may be strained and the subject may attempt to personalize the conflict. The interrogator must resist any attempt by the subject to do so.

The second danger is the natural tendency to resort to ruses and trickery to get the interrogation over with quickly. The purpose of the reconnaissance phase is to probe- The interrogator should reserve his firepower until he knows exactly what he's up against. Many such "tricks" are only able to be used once, and as mentioned prior, swapping techniques repeatedly only emboldens a subject and allows his ability to resist to continue expanding.

C) The Detailed Questioning

The detailed questioning phase is exactly as the name implies; it goes deeper than the basic level of questioning present during the opening, and is (essentially) the “meat” of the interrogation. Here is where you will utilize interrogation techniques and other ruses and trickery in order to obtain the information you’re looking for- This is also the phase where you will be refining your plan the most to encompass new information and developments.

Some major things to consider during the detailed questioning phase include the following:

- 1) What specific requirements you want to meet and what questions you want to use.
- 2) Remember to keep the questioning focused on the requirements.
- 3) Cover all elements of who, what when, where, why and how.
- 4) Determine of the subject’s knowledge of an event is first-hand, indirectly, or assumption.
- 5) Continue to re-examine the subject’s history in more detail.
- 6) Expect the subject’s psychological condition to vary periodically and to vary your technique.
- 7) Make the subject feel that your interest in him has remained consistent from start to finish.

Some major things to avoid during the detailed questioning phase include the following:

- 1) Do not allow the subject to determine your exact area of interest.
- 2) Do not allow the subject to determine the extent of your knowledge.
- 3) Do not give the subject a list of questions and ask him to answer them.
- 4) Do not ask questions requiring “yes” or “no” answers.
- 5) Do not push the interrogation beyond the rate planned; time is on your side.

This is perhaps the most dangerous step in the entire interrogation, as a prisoner may learn what exactly it is that the interrogator is looking for and take steps to ensure that he never divulges this information (which can lead to a belief that the subject knows nothing and may also lead to the possible release of a guilty suspect). By not allowing the subject to know exactly how much you know, you keep him in the dark about the true extent of your knowledge and may lead to the belief that, since you already know everything, it may be best to divulge what little he has left for a variety of reasons. This step is dangerous because it can lead to counter-interrogation; the practice of figuring out what it is the enemy wants by what types of questions they ask.

Other things to consider include:

- 1) Responding to the ideological argument.
- 2) Bargaining.
- 3) Threats.

The interrogator must be prepared to discuss the principles of and offer valid alternatives to the ideology that has motivated the subject to select his particular course of action; in the case of the MPF, this means being able to debate and convince a subject that choosing to resist is a futile course of action and that the resistance movement is incorrect in its views. The purpose of responding to the ideological argument is not to prove the subject wrong (as this relates back to leaving an “escape route” for the subject to take without making himself seem foolish) but instead to provide him with reasons which he can use to justify his switch of allegiances from one side of the other.

Having the proper approval to bargain with the subject is important when beginning the bargaining process; promising a subject something he can't have may lead to a gap in trust and the loss of rapport. You must be able to offer him something in exchange for his cooperation, or the bargaining track is useless. Prior to conducting the interrogation, the interrogator must be very sure as to what offers may be made and what may not.

For example, the subject may ask:

- 1) "What can you do for me if I cooperate?"
- 2) "What will happen to me if I don't cooperate?"
- 3) "Can you protect me from retaliation?"

Examples of offers the interrogator can make include:

- 1) Protection.
- 2) A new identity.
- 3) Relocation to a new city.
- 4) The chance to work against former colleagues (if the subject feels he was betrayed).

A threat is basically a means for establishing a bargaining position by inducing fear in the subject. A threat should never be made unless it is a part of the plan; furthermore, when a threat is used, it should always be implied that the subject himself is to blame for it, by using words such as "you leave me no choice but to...". The subject should never be told to comply "or else!".

Examples of threats include:

- 1) Returning the subject to his organization after compromising him.
- 2) Public exposure.
- 3) Deprivations of prison treats such as cigarettes.
- 4) Deportation to another city (separation from loved ones).
- 5) Confiscation of property.

D) The Termination

The disposition of the subject must be planned before the interrogation ever begins. Be sure to consider all of the points covered under "the termination" during the section on planning. You must guard against any possible trouble caused by a vengeful subject- The best defense is prevention through enlistment or compromise. However, due to the nature of Combine rule, execution and deportation to the labor camps can prove equally as useful.

The detailed questioning only ends when one of the following has occurred:

- 1) You have obtained all useful information.
- 2) You have more pressing requirements (this is the least commonly used).
- 3) You are ready to admit defeat.

Remember that the interrogator always has the advantage during the interrogation- He knows more about the subject than the subject knows about him. He creates, modifies, amplifies, and terminates the subject's environment; he selects the emotional keys under which the interrogation will proceed. The subject is acutely aware at all times that the interrogator controls his ultimate fate.

Interrogation techniques are techniques used to extract information from the subject. These techniques can range from simple questioning to elaborate ruses and trickery designed to confuse a subject and essentially trick him into providing information that he normally wouldn't have divulged otherwise.

Under the family of "interrogation techniques," there are two separate categories:

- 1) Non-coercive techniques.
- 2) Coercive techniques.

Non-coercive interrogation techniques operate on the assumption that subjects make admissions because they are in a state of mind which leads them to believe that cooperation is the best course of action for them to follow; the effective use of the proper technique will aid in developing this state of mind.

All non-coercive interrogation techniques are based on the principle of generating pressure inside the subject without the application of outside force. This is generally accomplished by manipulating him psychologically until his resistance is sapped and his urge to yield is fortified; in essence, ruses and tricky are used to beat down a subject's ability to resist.

The effectiveness of most coercive techniques depends on their unsettling effect; the interrogation process itself is unsettling to most people encountering it for the first time. The interrogator tries to enhance this effect by radically disrupting the familiar emotional and psychological associations of the subject. Once this disruption is achieved, the subject's ability to resist is severely impaired- Generally, the subject exhibits a sort of psychological shock, during which he is far more likely to comply than he was before he experienced the shock.

Frequently, the subject will experience feelings of guilt. Of the questioner can identify these guilty feelings, it will increase the subject's anxiety and his urge to cooperate as a means of escape. Remember, however, that the initial advantage always lies with the interrogator- From the outset, he knows a great deal more about the subject than the subject knows about him.

The number of variations in techniques is limited only by the experience and the imagination of the interrogator- The success and skill of an experienced interrogator lie in his ability to match the technique selected to the personality of the subject and his rapid exploitation at the moment of shock. However, the questioner should not try various techniques until he finds one that works. The use of unsuccessful techniques will, in itself, increase the subject's will and ability to resist. If the subject, in the opinion of the questioner, has the will and determination to withstand all non-coercive techniques, it is better to avoid them entirely for that very reason.

The following are examples of non-coercive techniques that an interrogator may use during the course of an interrogation- Often, a combination of one or more of the techniques work best rather than one simple approach.

- A) The Direct Approach – Asking a subject questions directly. This is commonly used on subjects with little to no security training, and on subjects that will offer little or no resistance- It is also used with subjects who have proven cooperative during a previous session.
- B) Nobody Loves You – Persuaded a subject to talk by pointing out that everything concerning his case has already been learned from persons who may be biased or malicious. The subject owes it to himself to be sure that the interrogator hears both sides of the story, or else he may be sentenced on the testimony of personal enemies without a word in his own defense.
- C) We Know Everything – Explaining to the subject that the interrogator already knows everything and that the purpose of the questioning is not to gain information, but instead to test the sincerity (honor, reliability, etc.) of the subject. The interrogator then asks the subject questions based on known data. If the subject lies, he is informed firmly and dispassionately that he lied. A file can be prepared containing all available information concerning the subject or his organization, which can be padded with extra paper to sustain the illusion. The interrogator then states that he has a complete record of the subject's life. By manipulating known facts, the interrogator may be able to convince a naïve subject that all his secrets are known and that further resistance is pointless- But if this technique does not work quickly, it must be dropped before the subject learns the true limits of the interrogator's knowledge.
- D) Double Informers – Planting two informants (A and B) in the same cell with the subject. Every now and then, "A" tries to pry information from the subject. At the proper time, and during A's absence, "B" warns the subject not to tell "A" anything because "B" suspects him of being an informant. The subject may then tell "B" information because of a bond of trust. Having "B" pretend to discover a hidden microphone and suggesting that he and the subject only talk in whispers on the other side of the room may serve to sustain the illusion.
- E) The Witness – A simple method that uses a "witness" to the subject's crime to walk by the subject and proceed to be "interrogated" in a closed room. When the witness returns, the interrogator will notify the guard that the subject "isn't needed anymore" because of the witness's testimony; this may result in the subject insisting on telling his side of the story. Related to "nobody loves you."
- F) Divide and Conquer – Used when two or more suspects are suspected of joint complicity. They should be separated immediately. If any information is available about subject "B," such information should be attributed to subject "A" to give the impression that "B" is talking. Edited documents and recordings can be played back to give the impression the "A" is trying to shift all of the blame on "B." Additionally, it can be implied that, since "A" is talking, he is going to be released back to his organization- And that "A" is going to notify the organization that "B" is talking. It is important during this ruse, however, that "A" be the weaker one in every respect (emotionally and psychologically).

- G) Good Cop/Bad Cop – A simple ruse where one interrogator shows a sympathetic attitude towards the subject, while the other exhibits more brutal, angry, or domineering attitudes. This evokes feelings of gratitude in the subject for the “Good Cop,” which will enhance the rapport for the interrogation to follow. This technique works best on women, teenagers, and timid men.
- H) Ivan is a Dope – Pointing out to a subject that his cover story was poorly conceived and that his organization botched the job; also suggesting that it is typical of his organization to ignore the welfare of its members. The interrogator then goes on to explain that he was impressed by the subject’s courage and intelligence and blames his failure on his organization. This sells the idea that the interrogator is a true friend who understands the subject and will look after his welfare.
- I) Unanswerable Questioning – Systematically and persistently asking a subject questions about matters of high policy, persons of prominence, technical detail, etc. to which he does not know the answer. When the subject complains he knows nothing of such matters, the interrogator insists that he would have to know and that even the most stupid man in his position would know. Eventually the subject is asked a question to which he does know the answer, and he feels tremendous relief at being able to answer the question.
- J) Nonsense Questions – Two or more interrogators ask the subject questions which seem straightforward but which are illogical and have no pattern. Any attempted response by the subject is interrupted by additional unrelated questioning. The subject finds his pattern of thought to be replaced by an eerie meaninglessness. Certain types of very orderly and logical subjects began to doubt their sanity and in their attempts to clarify the confusion make significant admissions and betray valuable information.
- K) Rapid-fire Questioning – The subject is asked a series of questions in such a manner that he does not have time to answer completely before the next question is asked. By limiting the time he has to formulate his answers, he may become confused and contradict himself; the questioner then confronts him with these inconsistencies and, in many cases, the subject will talk freely in an attempt to explain himself. In explaining his answers, he is likely to reveal more than he intended.
- L) Pride-and-Ego Down – The subject’s ego is targeted specifically to encourage cooperation, with the techniques used generally consisting of attacking the subject’s sense of personal worth. In an attempt to redeem his pride, the subject may provide information that he would not otherwise have in order to try to vindicate himself. This technique is especially effective in subjects who have displayed feelings of weakness or insecurity; a real or imaginary deficiency voiced about the source, loyalty to his organization, or any other feature can provide a basis for the technique. Alternatively, it can be implied that the subject is too weak or unable to perform a certain task- Or that his loyalty, intelligence, abilities, or leadership qualities have been called into question. However, if this technique fails, it is extremely difficult for the interrogation to move to another approach without losing credibility.

Coercive techniques are techniques that generate pressure in the subject through the use of outside force. These are generally simple and involve things such as solitary confinement, stress positions, sleep deprivation, and removal of food and water. However, these techniques are a double-edged sword; used often, they are likely to generate apathy, which is one of the hardest barriers to interrogation- When the subject doesn't care about his fate, it is extremely unlikely that he will divulge any useful information. As such, coercive techniques are to be used sparingly, especially physical methods of coercive torture, such as beatings, which give the impression to the subject that the interrogator is running out of options. Additionally, once violence is added and proven unsuccessful, it is nearly impossible to go back to more conventional ways of interrogation.

As the Universal Union has no need to take heed of the Geneva Conventions (and certainly has no problems with watchdog organizations), coercive techniques may seem like an appealing alternative to the often long and difficult processes of non-coercive interrogation. Why bother to play mind games with the subject when it can be beaten out of them with little effort and little time wasted in the booth? Certainly, torture can be effective in some (maybe even most) cases- People are liable to crack under intense pressure. However, torture is a double-edged sword; not only is it humiliating and oftentimes painful for the subject, it can also be humiliating and psychologically damaging to the interrogator.

While torture can often force people to crack swiftly, to those dedicated enough, it can often seem like a sign of weakness; physical violence especially (as mentioned before) can give the subject the impression that the interrogator is running out of options, and that if he only holds on for a little bit longer, than he will likely be released. While the moral aspects of torture can largely be ignored (except for, as mentioned, its effects on the interrogator), it also produces false information and enhances a subject's will to resist- People who are experiencing physical pain are liable to say anything to make it stop, even if only for a moment. However, there are other means of coercive techniques aside from physical violence and "torture" (in the sense that it is inflicting physical pain) that can be effective.

- A) Extremes – The subject is exposed to extremes of both hot and cold, but never so long for him to become comfortable with either. Alternatively, the subject can be exposed to extremes of moisture in the air, with the room being completely dry one moment and saturated the next. These extremes can be combined with sleep deprivation techniques for maximum effectiveness, as techniques involving extremes of anything can be considered routine-disrupting.
- B) Depersonalization – The subject's individuality is specifically attacked in order to force him to "conform" to the rest of a group. While depersonalization can be considered desirable in some circumstances (most notably in the use of recreational drugs), it is a dissociative disorder, and can result in severe anxiety and panic attacks. The subject may feel like he is living in a dream, where everything lacks significance- This may cause the subject to divulge information that he would not divulge in the "real world," but feels free to speak about in the "dream world." Depersonalization can be accomplished through learned helplessness, enforced nudity and head shaving, and routine-disrupting techniques.
- C) Sensory Deprivation – Stimuli from one or more of the subject's senses is deliberately removed or reduced. This can be accomplished by simply blindfolding and hooding the subject (or using earmuffs in the case of sound), but more complex devices can disrupt the subject's sense of smell, touch, taste, and sense of "gravity." Extended (or forced) sensory deprivation can result in extreme anxiety, hallucinations, and bizarre thoughts- As such, it is best used in conjunction with depersonalization techniques in order to enforce the idea that the subject is in a dream.

- D) Stress Positions – Stress positions are considered the least coercive technique available, and involve placing the human body in such a way that a great amount of weight is placed on just one or two muscles. This can be accomplished by forcing a subject to stand on just the balls of his feet and then be made to squat (thus leading to pain and then muscle failure) or in any number of other ways. Stress positions are especially useful as a way to test the subject's will to resist- As it is generally difficult to enforce many stress positions, if a subject continues to remain in one without being made to do so, it is a good sign that he his will to resist is not very high. Additionally, stress positions are important because the interrogator is not directly causing the subject pain- The subject is causing himself pain, which can lead to a loss of self-worth.
- E) White Torture – The subject is subjected to extreme sensory deprivation and isolation, which can lead to a loss of personal identity. Covering the subject's eyes, ears, hands and feet (as well as observing them 24 hours a day and keeping them in constant light) is one method of white torture; another method is the opposite, forcing them to wear heavy gloves, sound-reducing shoes, black garments and keeping them in total darkness. White torture is effective in keeping a subject under control once he leaves the booth, as it may lead to the belief by the subject that he is never really "free" and that all doors are closed on him. This is related directly to sensory deprivation.
- F) Mock Execution – The subject is deliberately (but falsely) made to feel that his execution, or the execution of another person, is either imminent or taking place. This may involve making the subject recount last wishes, making them dig their own graves, shooting near the victim (though not at them), or firing blanks. This also may involve faking the execution of a family member or cohort behind a bed sheet or some other similar object, so that only a silhouette is visible; alternatively, the subject could be placed in a helicopter and blindfolded, then pushed out- Unaware that he is only a few feet above the ground. The psychological trauma from a mock execution may lead the subject to break quickly.

It should be stressed that coercive techniques are not substitutes for interrogation, but instead modifiers used to assist the interrogator. Subjects still have to be questioned, and (in most cases) physical and/or psychological torture alone is not enough to break them. Interrogation is a battle of wits between the interrogator and the subject; the use of coercive techniques is not a "get out of jail free" card to bypass that battle. Coercive techniques are merely an embodiment of what is already known to the subject, as well as the interrogator; the interrogator holds all the cards, and he controls the subject's life, down to what temperature he feels and what time he gets up in the morning (if he is allowed to sleep at all).